

FINAL Minutes of IHRA Steering Committee (SC) Meeting

Sunday March 4, 2001, and Thursday, March 8, 2001

U.S. Mission

11 Rte de Pregny

1292 Chambesy

Switzerland

Attendees

Australia	Keith Seyer
	Allan Jonas
Canada	Brian Jonah
EC	Roberto Ferravante
	Anna Barras
EEVC	B. Friedel
France	Dominique Cesari
Hungary	Sándor Szabó
Italy	Claudio Lomonaco
Japan	Masahiko Naito
	Yoshiyuki Mizuno
	Takahiro Ikari
Poland	Wojciech Przybylski
Sweden	Anders Lie
The Netherlands	Gerard Meekel
United Kingdom	John Jeyes
	Richard Lowne
United States	Raymond Owings
	Joseph Kanianthra
	John Hinch

A list of the attendees= addresses and contact information is found at the end of the report as **Attachment 1.**

Agenda

Sunday, March 4, 2001

13.00 Welcome

13.30 Review of WP.29 presentation

17.00 ITS

Thursday, March 8, 2001

14.00 Welcome, Introductions, Sign-in, and Review of November 2000 Minutes

14.15 Discussion of the presentation to WP.29.

14.30 Discussion of the future direction of IHRA

- General SC agreement from Nov 00, meeting that IHRA should go forward
- Adjustments or modifications are needed
- Need for a better road map
- It was proposed that members take an assignment to write a proposal for review by all the members.
- Candidates presented at the November 2000 meeting as future IHRA activities
 - Data collection
 - Combining Frontal and Compatibility Working Groups makes sense.
 - IHRA role in Rollover crash mode
 - Child dummies

16.30 ESV review

17.00 IHRA Web site - Need to have WGs put working group minutes on site (Like ITS)

17.30 New Business

Next Meeting

Date: Sunday, June 3, 2001

Time: Luncheon (starting at noon) followed by Steering Committee meeting

Room: C

Location: RAI Center; Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Minutes, Sunday, March 4, 2001

Welcome

Ray Owings, IHRA Chair, welcomed the group. He reviewed the reason for splitting the meeting into 2 half days - Sunday was needed to review the presentation for WP.29, and Thursday was the regular IHRA meeting. John Hinch passed out two recent NHTSA publications: "99 Traffic Safety Facts – Overview" and "Buying a Safer Car for Child Passengers."

Review of WP.29 presentation

Ray Owings reviewed the schedule for the presentation to WP.29, indicating the presentation will be on Thursday, March 8, 2001, first thing in the morning. The approximate time for the WP.29 presentation is 09.30.

John Hinch discussed the distribution of the agenda and draft WP.29 presentation to the SC members. The document was converted to Adobe ".pdf" format and sent via e-mail prior to the meeting. The SC agreed that the distribution worked well and also agreed that IHRA should use a similar system for distribution in the future.

The SC reviewed the presentation slides prior to the meeting, and some members brought suggested changes for the SC to consider. The U.S. agreed that it would incorporate the agreed upon changes prior to the Thursday presentation at the meeting with WP.29 and make the presentation to WP.29 on behalf of the IHRA SC.

The SC reviewed the WP.29 presentation slide-by-slide. The following highlights the major comments and requested changes:

A new slide was added to define: “What is the IHRA?” The basis for the slide was taken from a Canadian document.

A reference was added to the IHRA slide to reflect a presentation Dr. Ricardo Martinez (then NHTSA Administrator) made to WP.29 in 1995. This was cited as the “genesis” of IHRA.

The SC discussed the use of “highway.” “vehicle.” And “traffic” in the terms that indicated the scope of the IHRA. The SC agreed that “traffic” safety was preferred to “highway” safety, and such changes were made to the slides.

Corrections were made to the member identification page to reflect:

- \$ John Jeyes is the U.K. member of the IHRA SC
- \$ Correction of spelling of Wojciech Przybylski's name
- \$ Changed ECE to EC

Several members pointed out that the presentation did not contain any reference to Functional Equivalence (FE). FE was discussed; and the SC decided that it should not be included, since it did not constitute a major effort within IHRA.

The SC agreed to drop the Time Line slide.

Each Working Groups' slides were reviewed and corrections were made as requested.

The Steering Committee decided to drop the “how does WP fit to IHRA” question slide.

IHRA/WP.29 flowchart slide:

There was a lot of discussion regarding this slide. Generally, it was neither well understood nor supported fully by the SC. There was agreement that it reflected the way IHRA currently conducted business. The SC agreed to drop this slide.

GR/WG relationship slide

There was some discussion regarding this slide. Several minor edits were made regarding the names of the GRs. The connection of ITS was left broad, connoting that ITS could have possible connections with several GRs. Several of the SC members indicated they liked the slide layout. The title of the slide was changed to “Proposed Presentations.”

The note on each slide indicating draft was deleted. Further the SC members asked that the Chair tell the WP.29 that all IHRA WGs use real world crash data (as applicable) to make initial assessments.

ESV Conference

Some of the SC members asked if there would be a status report of the entire IHRA program given at ESV. The SC agreed to discuss further on Thursday. Several SC members expressed the view that they liked the new upload tool. There was some discussion regarding which governments were exhibiting at ESV. SC members agreed to check with their respective governments to see if there was any interest.

ITS

Canada led the ITS discussion, which was not completed at the November 2000 meeting, discussing two areas: Comments to the ITS WG and review of the conclusions made at the end of the ITS 5-year report.

Comments

It had been suggested that the ITS WG concentrate only on original equipment (OE) systems.

Brian Jonah indicated that this was a moot point since the WG is focusing on evaluation techniques, not actual equipment.

There was a request for a set of definitions for the ITS equipment. Specifically, it was asked if it included cell phones.

Brian Jonah indicated that these items were a bit difficult to define. One reason was that new technology was being introduced all the time, creating a moving target.

There was a request for a broader scope.

Brian Jonah reported that the WG agrees that the scope needs to be broadened. The WG believes that the emphasis should be on in-vehicle equipment. They do not see their mandate covering on-road ITS equipment.

There was a feeling that a framework for the ITS problem was needed along with a discussion of how it is to be regulated.

The ITS WG agrees that an approach is needed. The WG has discussed some principles, but has not come to a consensus.

What is the role of manufacturers?

Brian Jonah reported that the ITS WG believes that manufacturers should ensure that their equipment is safe. Beyond this the WG thinks there is also a role for government.

The number of activities should be refocused to fewer items (from US critical self review).

The WG disagrees with this concept and believes that the eight processes defined early in the IHRA ITS WG program are still valid and further believes that they should continue until all eight are completed. They are approaching these items in a serial manner. The WG is willing to be redirected if the SC so desires.

Discussion of report conclusions/recommendations

The SC discussed several on the conclusions and recommendations, including broader participation by the IHRA member countries/organizations and funding. The U.K. indicated it desired to participate more strongly. The U.K. indicated it would like to focus on both human factors and vehicle construction standards, adding that it felt that IHRA's ITS related research was being applied to aspects of vehicle design. Sweden indicated it felt that there was a clear need for definitions in IHRA's ITS arena, also adding that this would clarify some of the ideas of the ITS. The U.S. is looking at the human factors issues, because manufacturers are putting safety-impacting systems in vehicles now that are being used by drivers. There was a general discussion regarding funding, but no solutions were proposed or developed.

Summary of ITS discussions

The SC summarized this ITS discussion as follows:

- 1 - A better definition of ITS, as it applies to the IHRA, is needed.
- 2 - Resources - each member of IHRA has their own funding methodology.
- 3 - Funding for ITS is limited.
- 4 - The ITS WG will continue with the current approach for funding.

The meeting was adjourned around 17.00 Sunday.

Minutes, Thursday, March 8, 2001

Welcome and Review of Minutes

Secretariat Note: **WP.29 ANNOUNCED AT THIS (MARCH 2001) MEETING THAT IT HAD EXPANDED THE TIME REQUIREMENTS FOR ITS MEETING. STARTING WITH THIS MEETING, THE WP.29 MEETINGS WILL ENCOMPASS THE ENTIRE WEEK, WHEREAS PREVIOUSLY, THURSDAY AFTERNOON HAD BEEN OPEN. IHRA HAD COORDINATED WITH THE WP.29 TO HAVE ITS MEETINGS ON THURSDAY AFTERNOON, THUS ALLOWING THE IHRA SC TO MEET DURING THE SAME WEEK. WITH THE NEW WP.29 SCHEDULE, THURSDAY AFTERNOONS WILL NO LONGER BE AVAILABLE FOR IHRA. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULES WILL NEED TO BE PLANNED AT THE JUNE MEETING IN AMSTERDAM.**

For those who were not at the Sunday meeting, Ray Owings reminded the SC that we had held a meeting on Sunday afternoon and quickly reviewed the activities of Sunday. Ray Owings indicated that the IHRA had made a presentation to WP.29 earlier in the day. John Hinch said he would put the

presentation on the IHRA web site for all to access. [Action: John Hinch-Put slides on IHRA Web Site]

John Hinch reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting. Several changes had been requested prior to the meeting, which were reflected in the minutes. Additional comments were made during the review and some members agreed to send in corrections, all of which would be noted in the final minutes. It was agreed that the minutes should reference the 5-year WG status reports that would be presented at the ESV conference.

Secretariat Note: **THE EEVC INDICATED THAT IT WAS NO LONGER IN FAVOR OF RELEASING THE SC MINUTES. THE SC AGREED TO HOLD FURTHER POSTINGS OF WG MINUTES UNTIL THIS ISSUE IS RESOLVED AT THE JUNE MEETING.**

General Discussion

Ray Owings discussed ESV paper uploading.

Ray Owings started a discussion of the Low Tire Pressure Measuring Systems that congress had mandated that NHTSA require in all new automobiles and light trucks. Anders Lie said that two European cars have tire pressure measuring systems: Citroen C5 and Renault Laguna.

Discussion of the Presentation to WP.29

Ray Owings led a discussion regarding the presentation made to the WP.29 earlier in the morning. John Jeyes and Gerard Meekel indicated they felt the presentation was good. There was no feedback from WP.29, for they will most likely not discuss the presentation until their next meeting. Ray Owings indicated that this action was completed.

He reminded the SC that the WGs were committed to give the GRs a significant presentation regarding the ongoing research in each WG. These presentations are to be coordinated by the lead country for each WG, and should be coordinated with Claudio Lomonaco, chair of GRSP. Claudio Lomonaco indicated that a possible date for these presentations was at December GRSP meeting, currently scheduled for the week of Dec 3, 2001.

Note: THE LEAD COUNTRY FOR EACH WG IS RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING A PRESENTATION WITH THE APPROPRIATE GR. IT SHOULD BE SCHEDULED AFTER ESV.

ESV Conference

Gerard Meekel reported that preparations for ESV were vigorously proceeding. Ray Owings and Gerard Meekel reminded all that the 10 minutes oral presentation was very FIRM. Sándor Szabó said that there would not be a presentation from Hungary, following up with the reason that he was at the SC as an observer only. Gerard Meekel is assuming there will be a report from all the other countries.

B Friedel posed a question regarding the press. Gerard Meekel said that officials & press have free access to the conference if they can identify themselves as journalists. They can listen to technical session, go to opening sessions, but must pay for lunch and drinks. There would be onsite registration for the press.

IHRA web site

Ray Owings reported that the IHRA web site is not very populated. To date, only the SC and ITS pages are up to date. Keith Seyer said the Side Impact WG had provided their inputs for the web page. John Hinch indicated that in its current state, the web site is not very useful to the public.

ESV Awards

Ray Owings discussed that he was about to make the decision and would be contacting the SC members to get their help in getting the nominations from the various countries through the government focal points.

Next meeting

The next meeting will be held in conjunction with ESV. The following details were provided:

Date: Sunday June 3, 2001

Time: Luncheon (starting at noon) followed by Steering Committee meeting

Room: Room "C"

Location: RAI Congress Centre; Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Question to the Steering Committee: **DO WE WANT TO ATTACH A COPY OF ALL THE CRITICAL SELF REVIEWS TO THE MINUTES FOR THE STEERING COMMITTEE? THIS WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF PLACING THEM ON THE IHRA WEB PAGES.**

IHRA Critical Self Review

Ray Owings presented an overview of the process and offered that EEVC make its presentation since its critical self-review had not been reviewed by the SC prior to this meeting.

B Friedel distributed copies of the EEVC Critical Self Review (CSR). The following summarizes B Friedel's comments:

ITS: EEVC is not involved in the WG.

Frontal Impact: EEVC recommends that this WG be put together with Compatibility WG

Compatibility: Same conclusions as Frontal, and recommends that long term research be explored.

Side Impact: EEVC believes work in side impact should continue for five years.

Biomechanics: EEVC not very satisfied with output of WG. They believe that there are insufficient minutes to document the meeting. EEVC believes the WG should continue, but a rewrite of the Terms of Reference is needed.

Pedestrian Safety: EEVC is willing to cooperate with future work, but does not want link with current work. EC is very close to a regulation, and does not want to hold up their regulatory activities. They would support long-term goals, and have concerns regarding the use of dummies. Further, EEVC believes the Terms of Reference should be revised, and the WG should continue for a period of five years.

SC: EEVC believes the SC should do additional work. EEVC believes the SC should establish link to WP.29 and be willing to share research findings with the GRs. EEVC believes that the SC should conduct regular assessments of IHRA work with respect to global regulations, adding that they believe that IHRA's approach is global. EEVC recommended that Terms of Reference should be reviewed very carefully. The overall recommendation from EEVC was they recommend continuation of IHRA work to gain scientific data to support regulations.

SC Summary of IHRA Review

There was a lively discussion. A summary of the discussion is found in **Attachment 2**. Two action items were decided:

- 1) Each WG would draft new Terms of Reference for their WG.
- 2) NHTSA would draft Terms of Reference for IHRA SC.

At the June meeting in Geneva, the SC would make its final decision regarding the continuation of IHRA

Ray Owings adjourned the meeting at 17.55.

Prepared by John Hinch

IHRA Secretariat

Date: March 12, 2001

Attachment 1 -

IHRA Steering Committee Attendee=s Addresses and Contact Information -- March 2001 Meeting

AUSTRALIA

Keith Seyer
Australian Department of Transport and Regional Services
GPO Box 594; Canberra ACT 2601; Australia
Tel: (61) 2 6274 7479
Fax: (61) 2 6274 7714
Email: keith.seyer@dotrs.gov.au

AUSTRALIA

Allan Jonas
Australian Department of Transport and Regional Services
GPO Box 594; Canberra ACT 2601; Australia
Tel: (61) 2 6274 7440
Fax: (61) 2 6274-7714
Email: allan.jonas@dotrs.gov.au

CANADA

Brian Jonah
Road Safety and Motor Vehicle Regulation Directorate
Transport Canada; 330 Sparks Street; Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0N5; Canada
Tel: (613) 998-1968
Fax: (613) 990-2913
Email: jonahb@tc.gc.ca

EEVC

B. Friedel
EEVC
Direktor und Professor; BASt, Bruederstrasse 53; D-51427 Bergisch Gladbach 1; Germany
Tel: 02204 / 43 600
Fax: 02204 / 43 676
Email: friedel@bast.de

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Roberto Ferravante
European Commission; Automotive Unit
DG ENTR / F / 5; Rue de le Loi 200 B AN 88 B 02/39; B-1049 Brussels; Belgium
Tel: (32) 2-29.69.250
Fax: (32) 2-29.69.637

Email: roberto.ferravante@cec.eu.int

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Anna Borras

European Commission

Rue de le Loi 200; B-1049 Brussels; Belgium

Tel: (322) 295 0469

Fax: (322) 296 9637

Email: anna.borras@cec.eu.int

FRANCE

Dominique Cesari

INRETS

Case 24; 69675 Bron cedex; France

Tel: (33) 4 72 14 2571

Fax: (33) 4 72 14 2573

Email: dominique.cesari@inrets.fr

GERMANY

HUNGARY

Sándor Szabó

Chief du Bureau ECE

AUTÓKUT, H-1518; Budapest Pf. 25; Hungary

Tel: 361-203-00-18

Fax: 361-203-76-34

Email: autokut.egb@ax.hu

ITALY

Claudio Lomonaco

Ministero dei Trasporti, Direzione Generale della M.C.T.C.

Direzione Centrale IV, Divisone 40; Italia 00157 Roma Via Caraci, 36; Italy

Tel: (39) 6-41-58-6280

Fax: (39) 6-41-58-3253

Email:

JAPAN

Masahiko Naito

International Affairs Office, Engineering and Safety Department

Road Transport Bureau, Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport

2-1-3 Kasumigaseki Chiyoda-ku; Tokyo 1008918; Japan

Tel: (81) 3-5253-8111 ext. 42-251

FINAL Minutes of IHRA Steering Committee (SC) Meeting

Sunday March 4, 2001, and Thursday, March, 8, 2001

IHRA WEB Site: www-ihra.nhtsa.dot.gov

Fax: (81) 3-5253-1639
Email: naito-m2qp@mlit.go.jp

JAPAN

Yoshiyuki Mizuno
Japan Automobile Standards Internationalization Center
#1119 Shuwa Kioicho TBR Bldg.; 5-7 Kojimachi, Chiyoda-ku; Tokyo, 102-0083; Japan
Tel: (81) 3-5216-7242
Fax: (81) 3-5216-7244
Email: mizuno@jasic.org

JAPAN

Takahiro Ikari
JASIC Geneva Office
80 Rue De Lausanne; 1202 Geneva; Switzerland
Tel: 41 - 22 - 731-3111
Fax: 41 - 22 - 731-3512
Email: taikari@attglobal.net

NETHERLANDS

Gerard Meekel
RDW Vehicle Technology and Information Cnt
P.O. Box 777; 2700 AT Zoetermeer; Netherlands
Tel: 31-79-3458.334
Fax: 31-79-3458.041
Email: gmeekel@rdw.nl

POLAND

Wojciech Przybylski.
Motor Transport Institute
Vehicle Approval and Testing Department; ul. Jagiellońska 80; 03-301 Warsaw; Poland
Tel: (4822) 811-25-10
Fax: (4822) 811-09-06
Email: wojtekp@its.waw.pl

SWEDEN

Anders Lie
Swedish National Road Administration
Traffic Safety; Röda Vägen 1; S-781 87 Borlänge; Sweden
Tel: (46) 243 75017
Fax: (46) 243 75480
Email: anders.lie@vv.se

UNITED KINGDOM

John Jeyes
U. K. Department of the Environment & Transport
76 Marsham Street; London SW1P4DR; United Kingdom
Tel: (44) 20 7944 2080
Fax: (44) 20 7944 2069
Email: john_jeyses@dets.gsi.gov.uk

UNITED KINGDOM

Richard Lowne
Transport Research Laboratory
Old Wokingham Road; Crowthorne, Berkshire RG456AU; United Kingdom
Tel: (44) 1344-77-0617
Fax: (44) 1344-77-0356
Email: rlowne@trl.co.uk

UNITED STATES

Raymond Owings
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NRD 01)
400 7th Street, S.W.; Washington, D.C. 20590; United States
Tel: (202) 366-1537
Fax: (202) 366-5930
Email: ROWings@nhtsa.dot.gov

UNITED STATES

Joseph Kanianthra
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NRD 10)
400 7th Street, S.W.; Washington, D.C. 20590; United States
Tel: (202) 366-4862
Fax: (202) 366-5930
Email: Joseph.Kanianthra@nhtsa.dot.gov

UNITED STATES & IHRA SECRETARIAT

John Hinch
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NRD 01)
400 7th Street, S.W.; Washington, D.C. 20590; United States
Tel: (202) 366-5195
Fax: (202) 366-5930
Email: John.Hinch@nhtsa.dot.gov

Attachment 2 -

Notes from the discussion of the future of IHRA

The following presents an overview of the SC's review of the IHRA program.

I - NEW ACTIVITY DISCUSSION

Several potential new areas for research were discussed. The following views were expressed:

- a. In order for the SC to consider any new items, it would need to identify who will be the sponsor and for what purpose.
- b. The SC should continue in its current format and try to finalize the current ongoing research.
- c. If a new WG is started, it should be in a different area than crashworthiness (CW).
- d. Operating six or seven WGs would be a difficult task.
- e. The following items were discussed in some detail:
 - a. Rollover
 - b. Data Collection and Event Data Recorders
 - c. Child Safety
 - d. Rear Impact
 - e. Virtual Testing

II - STEERING COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

The following items as related to the SC were discussed:

a. - Terms of Reference for SC

1. There was an agreement for a new Terms of Reference.
2. Needs to include a method of obtaining regulatory foundations.

Action: NHTSA will develop a new Terms of Reference for the SC

b. - Terms of Reference for the WGs

1. The SC agreed that it should obtain Terms of Reference from the current WGs and move forward to complete their research.
2. Each WG should update their Terms of Reference.
3. Some WGs may not need 5-6 years more.
4. Clear guidelines for conducting research and reporting would make it easier to manage the WGs workload.

Action: WGs need to develop new Terms of Reference, to be coordinated by the lead country for each WG.

c. - Meeting Schedule of Steering Committee

The SC agreed to hold annual SC meetings, using the following guidelines:

1. Met during the ESV in those years where there is an ESV conference
2. Meet in the spring in the other years.
3. The meeting would be for a longer time period
4. Each WG to make a formal report to the SC.

d. - Number of Working Groups

The SC discussed the number of working groups it felt it could support.

1. There was general agreement that the number should not exceed 6.
2. The SC agreed that it would be desirable to see the current groups continued.

e. - Rotation of Lead Countries

After a short discussion, the SC decided not to rotate the lead countries at this time.

f. - Combining Advanced Frontal and Compatibility WGs

There was some discussion on this topic.

1. Anna Barras, speaking for the EC, said they did support combining these WGs.
2. Most other SC members supported combining the two WGs.
3. The two WGs tend to hold their meetings at the same time and that many of the members are the same people, therefore continuing makes sense.

III - LINKAGE WITH WP.29

The SC discussed the linkage of the IHRA and WP.29's Groups of Experts (GR).

1. The SC agreed that there should be some linkage with WP.29's groups of experts.
2. The SC also agreed that this could best be done through a series of briefings.
3. The SC asked the WGs to coordinate with the appropriate GR chair to arrange a briefing, assuming the GR was in favor of such a briefing.
4. The SC will brief the WP.29 at the conclusion of the IHRA, or at other time as the two organizations feel is appropriate.